



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,935	04/25/2001	Elfriede Sextl	32301WC164	5984

7590

10/03/2003

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SUITE 800
1850 M STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

CAIN, EDWARD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/840,935	Applicant(s) SEXTL ET AL.	
	Examiner Edward J. Cain	Art Unit 1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Concannon et al.

Concannon et al disclose thermoplastic films incorporating ZSM-5 zeolite in proportions encompassed by applicant claims (see Table II and Table IV). Applicants limitations to Si/Al ratios and water adsorption capacity are seen as inherent to the ZSM-5 of the reference since the ZSM-5 designator is assumed to describe a standard zeolite structure.

Applicants limitation to packaging materials or structural parts is not seen as patentably distinguishing over the films of the reference without more detailed structural limitations.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Concannon et al.

Concannon teaches thermoplastic compositions containing ZSM-5 as discussed above. The reference fails to explicitly recite a particle size for the zeolite.

Art Unit: 1714

It is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to select particles sizes such as claimed instantly when film thicknesses of the order of 10 to 15 um were desired.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus et al.

Marcus et al disclose deodorizing polymeric compositions containing zeolites in amounts such as are claimed instantly. The zeolite used may be ZSM-5 and possesses applicants claimed properties (column 3, line 63 to column 5, line 49 and column 6, line 27). The final product may be in the form of a fiber as taught at column 8, lines 12-50.


It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select ZSM-5 zeolite as the odor absorber in the compositions of the reference from those taught by the reference as suitable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Cain whose telephone number is (703) 308-0042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

EDWARD J. CAIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500



Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Concannon et al.

Concannon et al disclose thermoplastic films incorporating ZSM-5 zeolite in proportions encompassed by applicant claims (see Table II and Table IV). Applicants limitations to Si/Al ratios and water adsorption capacity are seen as inherent to the ZSM-5 of the reference since the ZSM-5 designator is assumed to describe a standard zeolite structure.

Applicants limitation to packaging materials or structural parts is not seen as patentably distinguishing over the films of the reference without more detailed structural limitations.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Concannon et al.

Concannon teaches thermoplastic compositions containing ZSM-5 as discussed above. The reference fails to explicitly recite a particle size for the zeolite.

Art Unit: 1714

It is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to select particles sizes such as claimed instantly when film thicknesses of the order of 10 to 15 um were desired.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus et al.

Marcus et al disclose deodorizing polymeric compositions containing zeolites in amounts such as are claimed instantly. The zeolite used may be ZSM-5 and possesses applicants claimed properties (column 3, line 63 to column 5, line 49 and column 6, line 27). The final product may be in the form of a fiber as taught at column 8, lines 12-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select ZSM-5 zeolite as the odor absorber in the compositions of the reference from those taught by the reference as suitable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Cain whose telephone number is (703) 308-0042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

EDWARD J. CAIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500

